



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,350	08/08/2001	Soren Ebdrup	5738.204-US	3619

7590 11/25/2002

Reza Green, Esq.
Novo Nordisk of North America Inc.
Suite 6400
405 Lexington Avenue
New York, NY 10174-6401

EXAMINER	
BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER

1624

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2002

8

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,350

Applicant(s)

EBDRUP ET AL.

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 4 . 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Applicant's election of Group I, claims 1-23 in Paper No. 7 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)). Claims 1-23 will be examined to the extent they embrace the elected invention. Election of species is also acknowledged.

Claims 1-23 are pending.

Priority

Applicant's claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(e) is acknowledged. However, the provisional application upon which priority is claimed fails to provide adequate support under 35 U.S.C. 112 for claims 19, 21 and 23 of this application. Several species embraced in the instant claim 19, 21 and 23 are not enabled in the provisional application.

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

However, applicants are not granted priority to claims 19 21 and 23 for reasons said forth as above. The priority document has no enablement for the said species, composition and method of use.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Following reasons apply. Any claim not specifically rejected is rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim.

1. Recitation of the phrase "comprising" in the definition of 3-6 membered heterocyclic ring at various places of claim 1, renders the claim indefinite as the term is open-ended and can include more than what is being positively recited therein. See MPEP 2111.03 which states: The transitional term "comprising", which is synonymous with "including," "containing," or "characterized by," is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements or method steps. See, e.g., *Genentech, Inc. v. Chiron Corp.*, 112 F.3d 495, 501, 42 USPQ2d 1608, 1613 (Fed. Cir. 1997) ("Comprising" is a term of art used in claim language which means that the named elements are essential, but other elements may be added and still form a construct within the scope of the claim.); *Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.*, 793 F.2d 1261, 229 USPQ 805 (Fed. Cir. 1986); *In re Baxter*, 656 F.2d 679, 686, 210 USPQ 795, 803 (CCPA 1981); *Ex parte Davis*, 80 USPQ 448, 450 (Bd. App. 1948) ("comprising" leaves "the claim open for the inclusion of unspecified ingredients even in major amounts").
2. Recitation of the term "prodrug" in claim 1 is deemed as indefinite. Prodrugs in general and as noted in specification, page 7, are compounds, which undergo in vivo hydrolysis to parent active drug. These are in general esters, amides, carbamoyl etc. In that sense recitation of prodrug is acceptable. However, the

various variable groups permitted in the compound of formula I also include such groups which are also likely to undergo the said transformation to the parent compound. It is not clear in that sense what is the prodrug that is being recited in the claim. Is it structurally different from the groups such alkoxycarbonyl amides etc recited for variable groups? If so what is it and what way one would regard the "prodrug" as different from above said groups if present in a compound is not clear. Furthermore, the structural make-up of the prodrug used in the generic sense is not known and hence the process of making the prodrug is therefore would be a speculation. It is not clear what is the relevance of a prodrug in a process claim.

3. Recitation of metabolites in claim 1 renders the claim indefinite as the structural make-up of the metabolites is not taught in the specification. Specification recites incubation of the compound formula I with hepatic cells and analysis of the incubant to arrive at metabolite(s). But it is not possible to develop a process without knowing the structure of the compound and there is no guarantee that the instant process would necessarily lead to the said product.
4. Process d) of claim 1 and claim 5 is indefinite for more than one reason. First of all, it is not clear what the relevance of definition of X as formula IV' has no X. In addition the X' definition remains unknown in view of the proviso recited in these claims. Note whereas X' is defined as selected from groups defined for X, the proviso recites $X' \neq X$. Thus it is not clear what is X'.

Art Unit: 1624

5. Claims 18 and 19 are indefinite as they recited as product by a process. However, the product is same whatever the process by which they are made and hence it is not clear what additional limitation is being claimed by the phrase "obtained by a process according to claim 1".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen et al. 5,889,002.

See column 14, lines 29-67, column 15 lines 1-30, for two processes which are also claimed in the instant claim 1 and 13. See for enablement examples 1-3 on column 20 through 22.

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in

Art Unit: 1624

the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-7,9-10 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pirotte et al. 5,459,138 in view of Nielson et al. US 5,889,002.

Pirotte et al teaches several process of making pyridinothiadiazinedioxide which include the processes a), b), c), and d) claimed in the instant claims. See column 5 through column 9. See for experimental details preparations and examples on column 11 through column 35.

Instant process claims require a thieno-fused 1,2,4-thiadiazinedioxide whereas the reference teaches pyridino-fused 1,2,4-thiadiazinedioxide.

The secondary reference Nielsen et al. US 5,889,002, teaches the equivalency of thieno-fused 1,2,4-thiadiazinedioxide with several heterocyclic ring fused thiadiazinedioxide including pyridino-fused thiadiazinedioxide. See formula I on column 2 and note the definition of A ring. Note various hetero-fused thiadiazines are enabled. See column 20-27 Also note the process on col. 14, line 29-54 which is also claimed in the instant process.

Note the starting material of the primary reference and the secondary reference are analogous and there is a clear-cut teaching in the secondary reference that the reaction that presence of different A ring does not alter the course of the process as the reaction centers are not affected by the presence of the different A ring.

Hence, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made would have been motivated combine the teachings of the primary reference with the teachings of the secondary reference and employ all the process parameters taught by these prior art including the process variation permitted and expect to obtain the desired

Art Unit: 1624

product because he would have expected the analogous starting materials behave similarly under the reaction conditions taught by these prior art. It has been held that application of an old process to an analogous material to obtain a result consistent with the teachings of the art would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill.

See also MPEP 2144.05, which says, under Optimization Within Prior Art Conditions or Through Routine Experimentation:

Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." *In re Aller*, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955) (Claimed process which was performed at a temperature between 40°C and 80°C and an acid concentration between 25% and 70% was held to be prima facie obvious over a reference process which differed from the claims only in that the reference process was performed at a temperature of 100°C and an acid concentration of 10%). See also *In re Hoeschele*, 406 F.2d 1403, 160 USPQ 809 (CCPA 1969) (Claimed elastomeric polyurethanes which fell within the broad scope of the references were held to be unpatentable thereover because, among other reasons, there was no evidence of the criticality of the claimed ranges of molecular weight or molar proportions.). For more recent cases applying this principle, see *Merck & Co. Inc. v. Biocraft Laboratories Inc.*, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir.), cert. denied,

Art Unit: 1624

493 U.S. 975 (1989); *In re Kulling*, 897 F.2d 1147, 14 USPQ2d 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990); and *In re Geisler*, 116 F.3d 1465, 43 USPQ2d 1362 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1,13 and 18-23 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-31 of U.S. Patent No. 5,889,002. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter namely the compound, composition, method of use and process embraced in the instant claims are also embraced in the US 5,889,002.

Claims 1,13 and 18-23 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-25 of U.S. Patent No. 6,329,367. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter namely the compound,

Art Unit: 1624

composition, method of use and process embraced in the instant claims are also embraced in the US 6,329,367.

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statement (paper # 4) are made of record.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (703) 305-1674. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from 8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is Mukund Shah whose telephone number is (703) 308-4716. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.


Venkataraman Balasubramanian

11/21/2002